

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 1267-004 5617 10/772,708 02/05/2004 Antonio Luis Francalacci Franca EXAMINER 12/03/2004 Nicholas P. Chiara, Esq. JACKSON, SUZETTE JAMIE HEDMAN & COSTIGAN, P.C. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 3738

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		4
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/772,708	FRANCALACCI FRANCA, ANTONIO LUIS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Suzette J Jackson	3738
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	nication appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum st - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a munication. BO) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir tatutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
3) Since this application is in condition	ed on <u>02 September 2004</u> . 2b) This action is non-final. for allowance except for formal mattice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2 and 3</u> is/ 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	/are withdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers	•	
	: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyarg the correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
2. Certified copies of the priority3. Copies of the certified copies	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No. <u>10/772,708</u> . received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		(0.70, 440)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	PTO-948) Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/772,708 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Newly submitted claims 2-3 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: This is a process or method claim classified is 128/898 for using an article.
- 2. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 2 and 3 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris 3,811,133 in view of Shirer 2004/0076848 and further in view of Nelson 2,473,723.

*Application/Control Number: 10/772,708

Art Unit: 3738

Harris discloses the invention as claimed comprising a wall which is molded to form a cavity therein wherein the cavity is adapted to be shaped in the size of a breast (see col. 4, lines 9-22) however Harris does not state that the mold is a transparent plastic. Shirer teaches molds that are made from translucent thermoplastics (see [0010, 0019]) can be made to conform to any body shape [0007, 0023], however Harris nor Shier specify that the size and shape are agreed upon by a medical professional. Nelson teaches that after molds are formed the patient is called in and tested (see col. 3, lines 55-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture a mold or pre-form from a clear/translucent/transparent plastic in order to further aid in seeing the body part that is being molded; it is also obvious (if not inherent) to consult with a medical professional in order to ensure correct manufacture and positioning of the device.

Page 3

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended to the claims to incorporate functional language and methods of consulting medical professionals. The originally elected claims examined in the office action dated 6/3/04 were toward a breast mold which is an article. The intended use recitation/functional language carries no patentabale weight in 'Application/Control Number: 10/772,708 Page 4

Art Unit: 3738

the absence of any distinguishing structure. Harris clearly discloses the structure as claimed and is found to be inherently capable of performing the function

Conclusion

- 6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 7. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzette J. Jackson whose work schedule is Monday-Friday 9-6:30 off every other Friday and whose telephone number is 571-272-4751.

*Application/Control Number: 10/772,708

Art Unit: 3738

Page 5

- 9. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306.
- 10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

Suzette J. Gherbi

26 November 2004

Đavid H. Willse Primary Examiner